

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY  
 INTERVIEW WITH TIM RUSSERT ON NBC-TV PROGRAM, "MEET THE PRESS"  
 WASHINGTON, D.C.  
 NOVEMBER 27, 1994

MR. RUSSERT: Mr. Secretary, you just heard Richard Roth's report that Bihac is falling to the Serbs, or may have already fell, at least militarily. What is the very latest?

SEC. PERRY: The very latest is very much as he described it, which is that the Serbs are in control of the situation. They have not occupied Bihac, and it seems clear that they could occupy it if they decide to do that.

The -- we're not indifferent to that situation. The United Nations, as you know, is working for a cease-fire. They -- NATO is prepared to respond with air strikes if the United Nations asks them. The United Nations has not been asking for air strikes, and therefore we are really powerless to conduct air strikes to influence that situation.

I should say, though, that even if they were to ask for air strikes, the air strikes cannot determine the outcome of the ground combat. They can punish the Serbs, but they cannot determine the outcome of the ground combat.

MR. RUSSERT: Haven't the Serbs won the war?

SEC. PERRY: (Pause) The Serbs have had -- occupied 70 percent of the country. There's no prospect, as I see it, of the Muslims winning that back. They have tried to win it back. They initiated the offensive at Bihac. They actually gained some ground for a month or so, and now the Serbs -- in conjunction, I might say, with the Muslim separatist force -- have succeeded in pushing them back beyond where they were at the beginning of the Muslim offensive. Therefore, it seems that the Serbs have demonstrated military superiority on the ground.

MR. RUSSERT: A lot of concern in this country, obviously, as to what the mission will be for the 2,000 Marines who have been sent offshore. It's been described as a precautionary mission. What does that mean? Will the American Marines be involved in this conflict?

SEC. PERRY: We have no plans to send ground combat forces into Bosnia to get involved in the war. That's not the purpose of the Marines over there. Two thousand would not be enough to do it

if we were going to do that. Those Marines are there, as they have been there in the past, in a contingency operation and rescue operation, if that becomes necessary.

MR. RUSSERT: One of the suggestions being made in this country and elsewhere is for to lift the arms embargo, for the United States and other allied countries to provide weapons to the Muslims to even up the fight. Will you now be in favor of lifting the arms embargo?

SEC. PERRY: Let me point out what we have been doing over there to date with our military has been limited to trying to stop the spread of the war beyond Bosnia and to limit the violence compared with, say, a year ago when there were thousands of people being killed a month there. Those objectives have been very successful so far. We obviously would like to stop the war, too. That objective has not been possible.

The diplomacy of the contact group has not succeeded in stopping the war. At this stage, the alternatives -- the alternatives, one, as you suggest, is lifting the embargo. A unilateral lifting of the embargo would, without question, drive the UNPROFOR forces, the U.N. forces, out of Bosnia. It would lean to a widening of the war, it would lead to more violence, and, no, I am not in favor of a unilateral lifting of the embargo. It would simply increase the violence of the war and could possibly lead to a spreading of the war.

MR. RUSSERT: We woke up this morning in America, headlines: U.S., Europe in serious rift over Bosnia war; Allies resent GIs absence as Americans call for action; NATO, the U.N. quarrel on Bosnia.

Twenty years from now, when the history of this period is written, what are people going to say about the first post-war conflict in Bosnia -- 200,000 people dead in two years -- and the allies basically did nothing?

SEC. PERRY: Well, it's not that the allies did nothing, it's the allies did not elect to go in to affect the outcome of the war. They went in as peacekeepers.

Now, peacekeepers have been successful in limiting the violence and limiting the spread of the war. They have not been successful in stopping the war, and that's what we would say about it.

In order to stop that war, in order to -- Secretary-General Klaes has estimated it would take 100,000 troops with heavy weapons to even enforce a peace. To affect the outcome of the war, to win

the war, so to speak, would take several hundred thousand troops with heavy weapons, and it would -- undoubtedly involving significant casualties.

Now, President Clinton has decided not to make that commitment. President Bush before him decided not to make that commitment, and I have to tell you, Tim, that I am not prepared to recommend the deployment of those several hundred thousand ground troops.

That's the alternative. People who do not like the outcome of this war need to reflect on what the alternatives are -- the real alternatives, not the rhetorical alternatives.

MR. RABEL: Mr. Secretary, then when does it become in the national interest of the United States? At what point do we draw a line?

President Bush, as you pointed out, elected not to do it, but he said that if the war spread to Kosovo that that would be a point at which United States troops ought to be introduced into that region. So at what point do we finally decide that it is in our national security interests to commit ourselves?

SEC. PERRY: We have expressed our national interest. Our national interests are to stop the spread of the war and to limit the violence. We have -- to stop the spread of the war, we have actually deployed some ground troops. We deployed them in Macedonia, as you know.

If the war were to spread beyond that, then there's very much the possibility that the national interests be extended -- would be increased to the extent, to the extent that we would consider more substantial actions than we've taken now.

MR. RABEL: Well, where would it have to be -- where would the war have to expand to for us to consider it our national interests?

SEC. PERRY: We're not going to draw a line in the sand and we're not going to state precisely what hypothetical situations would cause it, but it is very clear that the spreading of the war, stopping the spreading of the war is the major national interest that the United States has today.

MR. RABEL: So there's a possibility that at some point the United States would introduce ground troops to stop the war?

SEC. PERRY: We have, as I said, already introduced some ground forces in Macedonia.

MR. RABEL: Well, I mean, there are only a few hundred there in Macedonia. I'm talking about the kind of expansion that would require hundreds of thousands of United States troops.

SEC. PERRY: We would have to consider --

we'd have to consider that if the situation arose.

MR. RABEL: Let me ask you this, sir: We cut short the port visit of those Marines at Toulons, France, four days early to send them there to Bosnia. Why do this early? What message did we want to send? If you say that 2,000 Marines can't effect any change on the ground, why are we sending them there? Why do we want to use them in the first place? If you send them, why don't you use them?

SEC. PERRY: Well, first of all, 2,000 would not be enough to go in and affect combat. Secondly, more importantly, we have not made a decision to enter the war with ground combat troops. We do not plan to do that. The purpose of the Marines was not to go there for ground combat, it was to conduct a rescue operation if a rescue operation's necessary. They're there on contingency purposes as a rescue team.

We have, as you know, many airplanes -- we had 40 airplanes in one mission alone a few days ago flying over there. The possibility of downed aircraft and pilots needing rescue is not remote.

MR. RUSSERT: Mr. Secretary, are you concerned that there is an image of NATO now that it has become impotent, that it will say, "If you do that, we're going to do this," and the Serbs say, "Oh, yes?" And the Serbs march and march and march and take, as you say, 70 percent of the country, and NATO's response is timid at best. What is the future of NATO?

SEC. PERRY: There is an image problem, to be sure, Tim, but let me be very clear: NATO has done what it said it would do. NATO responds with air strikes whenever the United Nations asks for air strikes. We have, as you know, a two-key arrangement there, that the U.N. has to request the strikes and then NATO conducts them.

At our defense ministers' meeting in Spain two months ago, we made a very strong set of conditions, that we will fly air strikes only if we're going to fly them robustly, and since that time, we have done that.

Now the last -- this mission where we bombed the airfield, for example, we had 40 NATO aircraft in there. This was a robust and a very effective air strike. But NATO does not have the right and never asserts the right to unilaterally go in and conduct air strikes.

We only go in at the request and the coordination of the U.N. forces. They are not requesting air strikes in Bihac today. We are prepared to conduct

them if they request them.

MR. RUSSERT: If the Serbs move on the other five safe havens, should the United Nations then request robust air strikes from NATO to prevent the fall of the other safe havens?

SEC. PERRY: Tim, the five safe havens are in somewhat different conditions. In Sarajevo and in Goradze, we have established exclusion zones, heavy weapon exclusion zones. We've already conducted air strikes in support of those exclusion zones. We're prepared to conduct more. So in those two, at least, we are prepared to conduct extensive air strikes. But, again, they have to be at the request of the United Nations.

MR. RABEL: But, Mr. Secretary -- excuse me just briefly -- you called those "robust" air strikes against Odvina airfield in Croatia, but, as a matter of fact, it didn't touch any one of those aircraft, those Serb aircraft, which went over to attack Bihac. Doesn't this just contribute, once again, to the image that NATO is weak and doesn't really carry out very formidable or robust --

SEC. PERRY: The test of the mission is whether it accomplished its objective. The objective of that mission was to stop the bombing of Bihac. It succeeded in stopping the bombing of Bihac. Therefore it was successful. You measure the success by that objective, not by how much damage is done on the ground.

MR. RUSSERT: Let me turn to Haiti, Mr. Secretary. You were down there on Thursday.

SEC. PERRY: Yes.

MR. RUSSERT: President Aristide has requested before the American troops leave that you embark on a wholesale disarming of military, paramilitary, police, attaches, get the weapons out of the hands of the bad guys, as Mr. Aristide would say. Will the United States accede to Mr. Aristide's request and do that for him before the troops leave?

SEC. PERRY: Haiti has been a very great success story, I believe, and I took -- I visited with our troops when I was down there. I was there with Congressman Murtha, by the way, and we both visited four different bases down there, met with the troops there. They are doing a fantastic job. President Aristide came with us on two of the four visits, and he also complimented the troops on the job that they're doing.

The specific question you're asking me, though, relative to disarming -- we have already collected 14,000 weapons in Haiti, which is no small number. We don't know how many there are in total, but

14,000 is a very significant collection to date. We conducted, a few days ago, a spot search of automobiles going through Haiti, looking for weapons, and of the hundreds of automobiles, we found only one weapon, and that was an authorized weapon. So it's not clear that there are a lot of loose weapons around there.

I might say that Haiti is about the size of Maryland, and you might reflect on the task that would be required to remove all the weapons from the state of Maryland, including the city of Baltimore. This is no small task that's being requested, but we have done a very good job, I believe, of collecting weapons and of stabilizing the security there.

MR. RUSSERT: If we leave and the forces opposed to Mr. Aristide resurrect themselves fully armed and attempt to topple his government, will we intercede again to protect President Aristide?

SEC. PERRY: We're not leaving until we have a security situation established there, which includes bringing up a Haitian police force. We are in the process of training that police force today. We've already trained more than a thousand, and by the first of the year, there will be several thousand Haitian police officers trained by American and U.N. forces. Now, that's the key to turning it over to the Haitians -- the successful bringing up of the Haitian police force.

MR. RUSSERT: Ed?

MR. RABEL: How costly is this operation in Haiti? This administration has been criticized by the Republicans for spending defense dollars on missions like Haiti and elsewhere that they say we shouldn't be involved in. How costly is it?

SEC. PERRY: The operation is measured in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars, but the cost and the effect on our -- on the defense missions hinges on whether those costs are reimbursed by the Congress. We have requested supplemental fundings for reimbursement. We have been getting -- in the past, we have been -- Congress has been acceding to those supplemental funds. We have been hurt, frankly, in Haiti because the request for the funds was not granted soon enough, and therefore we had to curtail some training because of the funds for the Haiti and Rwanda operations had to come out of funds which otherwise would have been used for training.

MR. RABEL: Indeed, you testified before the Congress that three follow-on divisions were not ready because you didn't have the funds to train

them and to keep them up to operation. You also -- it is reported that you approved a plan to use reservists on some of the missions that the regular forces ought to ordinarily carry out. Have you approved such a plan, number one?

SEC. PERRY: First of all, what I -- I testified to the Congress twice. The first was last August, when I requested the supplemental funds, and at that time, I said if they were not granted immediately, we would have to curtail training. They were not granted immediately, we did curtail training, and therefore we had to reduce the readiness level on three of the divisions that missed the training cycle.

I subsequently reported back to the Congress that we had reduced the readiness on those.

So one of the things -- and, in the meantime, those supplemental funds have been granted, the training has been scheduled, and those three divisions will be back to their full readiness levels very soon.

The purpose of the reserves, using the reserves more, is to provide relief for active-duty forces in those particular areas where they are overstressed, some specialties, some units, where the demands on them are greater than the availability, and so we want to make a greater use of reserves to do that.

MR. RABEL: What's that going to mean for the weekend warriors? Are they going to have to be away from home much longer now?

SEC. PERRY: What we're proposing is that they take the two-week summer training, which is already planned, and combine that with some of the one-day-a-week training and make three, perhaps four weeks of assignments, rotation out to relieve active-duty units on occasion.

This is something we've discussed with some length with the reserves. They're quite enthusiastic about it, actually.

MR. RABEL: Final question from me. The Republicans say they want to increase defense spending. Wouldn't that be good for you?

SEC. PERRY: When the Congress meets in January, they're going to look at a whole set of alternatives. The -- I think in January the arithmetic is going to meet reality and I'm not basing my plans on any assumption of increased defense spending. I think the arithmetic is going to be compelling.

What I do expect to have is a considerable debate in the Congress over which programs are performed within that level of budget -- that is, I expect there to be a substantial debate over which programs we

are doing. Some of the Republicans may have a different view as to what the right program content is than we do. I am not expecting an increase in the budget, an increase in the top line of the defense budget.

MR. RUSSERT: Do you need an increase?

SEC. PERRY: We can meet our missions, we can maintain the readiness, with the level of budget we're proposing. The level of budget we're proposing, by the way, has substantial increases for readiness funds in it over '95, and '95 had substantial increases over '94. '94 was the year when this problem arose.

MR. RUSSERT: Mr. Secretary, finally, as you know, Jesse Helms, the soon to be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, questioned whether President Clinton was up to the role of commander-in-chief and then went further and said that if he came to a military base in North Carolina, he'd better bring a bodyguard.

What is your reaction to Senator Helms's comments, and do you look forward to working with him in his new role?

SEC. PERRY: I'm appalled by those comments. I think that the most important principle relative to the military is the civilian command. That is well accepted by the military. It has been accepted by the military at all levels that I've met and talked with, and I think it is very inappropriate for any senior official in the U.S. government to question that constitutional command or to say anything that would erode that.

MR. RUSSERT: Do you think that Senator Richard Lugar would be better suited to be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

SEC. PERRY: I'm not going to get into advising the Senate on how to organize their committees, but I am, I say, appalled at that comment.

MR. RUSSERT: Mr. Secretary, we thank you for joining us this morning and a belated happy Thanksgiving.

SEC. PERRY: Thank you, Tim.

MR. RUSSERT: Coming next, the next majority of the U.S. Senate and a very probable presidential candidate in 1996, Bob Dole.

END

NEW YORK TIMES  
Nov. 28, 1994  
Pg. 11

## Serbs' Gains Irreversible, Perry Asserts

### Defense Chief Says NATO Cannot Help

By MICHAEL R. GORDON  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27 — Defense Secretary William J. Perry said today that the Bosnian Serbs had demonstrated their superiority on the battlefield and that the Muslim-led Bosnian Government would be unable to reverse their gains even if NATO warplanes came to its aid.

"The Serbs have occupied 70 percent of the country," Mr. Perry said. "There's no prospect, as I see it, of the Muslims' winning that back."

Mr. Perry's statements, made on the NBC News program "Meet the Press," reflect the Pentagon's deep-seated fears about being drawn into the Bosnian war.

They also come as Clinton Administration officials are beginning to rethink their Bosnia policy after failing to win allied support to protect Bihac from Serbian nationalist attacks. A meeting of Cabinet-level officials on Bosnian and other European security issues is scheduled for Monday.

The Administration has supported a peace plan, accepted by the Bosnian Government, that would reduce the Serbian-held territory in Bosnia to 49 percent. But the utility of the plan has been called into question by the ability of the nationalist Serbs to continue to assault Bihac without further military reprisals from Western nations. After NATO air strikes last week, the Serbs have continued their attacks without any NATO response.

The Administration is faced with trying to think of new ways to apply military and economic pressure on the Bosnian Serbs, continuing to back peace talks despite the dim

prospects or writing off the negotiations as a losing proposition and distancing itself from the crisis.

American officials say the Administration is likely to continue to support the diplomatic effort to achieve a cease-fire in the name of NATO unity while trying to fend off Congressional pressure to lift the arms embargo unilaterally and take tougher action. The embargo, which applies to all sides in the war, has favored the better-armed Serbs.

Central to the dispute between the Administration and lawmakers are assessments of the military abilities of the Muslims and the utility of air power. Mr. Perry addressed both today, apparently in an effort to shape the public debate.

During the last year, air power has been one of the few means that Washington has had to try to influence the situation.

And as the Bosnian and Croatian Serbs advanced on Bihac during the last 10 days, the Administration pressed for the expanded use of air power to defend the town, including the adoption of a weapons exclusion zone and looser rules of engagement that would allow attacks on ammunition and supply depots outside the immediate vicinity of Bihac.

But Washington was rebuffed by Western European nations, who are fearful of ethnic Serbian retaliation against United Nations peacekeepers in Bosnia and appear to be calculating that additional compromises by the Muslims are the best way to end the two-and-a-half-year-old war.

With the Western European countries blocking expanded air strikes and the Pentagon wary of deeper involvement, Mr. Perry sought to dampen Congressional pressure for unilaterally lifting the embargo.

Instead of talking about military pressure that the allies could apply if the ethnic Serbs continued their attacks, Mr. Perry made the case against significant military intervention.

"NATO is prepared to respond with air strikes if the United Nations asks them," Mr. Perry said. "The United Nations has not been asking for air strikes, and therefore we are really powerless to conduct air strikes to influence that situation."

Mr. Perry added: "I should say, though, that even if they were to ask for air strikes, the air strikes cannot determine the outcome of the ground combat."

Mr. Perry said that only the politically unpalatable deployment of hundreds of thousands of allied troops would reverse the Bosnian Serbs' gains and impose a peace.

"The Serbs are in control of the situation," Mr. Perry said.

But Congressional critics say Mr. Perry has presented a false choice of doing nothing or sending hundreds of thousands of troops.

They say that if NATO's air strikes have been of limited effectiveness it is because they have been carried out under severe constraints. NATO air strikes last week were limited.

"I think we have a complete breakdown of NATO," Senator Bob Dole, the Kansas Republican and prospective Senate majority leader, said today. "We have U.N. vetoing of targets — driven by the British and the French."

Senator Dole added: "Let's lift the arms embargo. And let's at least let the Bosnians defend themselves."

USA TODAY

Nov. 28, 1994

Pg. 10

# U.S. decides against troop buildup

By Steve Komarow  
USA TODAY

The United States won't increase its presence in the former Yugoslavia despite an ominous shift in that civil war.

"People who do not like the outcome of this war need to reflect on what the alternatives are. The real alternatives, not the rhetorical alternatives," Defense Secretary William Perry said Sunday on NBC's *Meet the Press*.

To turn the tide against the Bosnian Serb rebels, who defy an international ultimatum and won't accept a peace plan, could take hundreds of thousands of troops.

"President Clinton has decided not to make that commitment. President Bush before him decided not to make that commitment, and ... I am not prepared to recommend the deployment," Perry says.

The United States has joined in NATO airstrikes against the rebels. But bad weather, avoidance of civilian casualties, and the constraints of diplomacy have combined to make the strikes nearly inef-

fectual.

Thumbing their noses at the latest raids by the world's most powerful alliance, the Bosnian Serbs are overrunning the city of Bihac. U.N. vows to protect the civilians there look thin.

"There is an image problem, to be sure," Perry says.

Meanwhile, cracks in the alliance that have been present ever since the dissolution of the Soviet Union are worsening. The North Atlantic nations maintain their Cold War military network, but can't agree on how to use it.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher and his diplomatic counterparts will work to patch things up, and figure out a next step in Bosnia, this week in a series of meetings in Brussels, Belgium.

Perry says people are expecting too much from the limited NATO operation.

NATO air raids "can punish the Serbs, but they cannot determine the outcome of ground combat," he said. He reiterated a premise easy to forget: "The allies did not

elect to go in to affect the outcome of the war. They went in as peacekeepers."

But while France, Britain and others put peacekeepers into the war zone, under U.N. auspices, the United States has kept its ground troops on the periphery.

And, under orders from Congress, U.S. warships no longer help allies block weapons bound for the Bosnian government.

Incoming Senate majority leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., also on NBC, says it's time to end the embargo that's hurt the Bosnian government more than the rebels.

Without putting a dollar figure on it, Dole also suggested the United States provide weapons to the Muslim-dominated Bosnian government.

Perry says such moves would drive the U.N. forces out of Bosnia.

"It would simply increase the violence of the war and could possibly lead to a spreading of the war," he says.

Last week, about 2,000 Marines were stationed off the coast to help in an evacuation of allies or if a U.S. jet was shot down.

WASHINGTON POST

Nov. 28, 1994

Pg. 1/18

# Perry Indicates U.S. Disarmament Of Aristide Opponents Is Unlikely

By Daniel Williams  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Defense Secretary William J. Perry yesterday all but rejected a call by Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide for U.S. troops to disarm opponents of his newly reinstalled government.

Perry compared the problems of taking weapons from Haitian thugs and army units of questionable loyalty to the difficulties that would be involved in disarming all of the state of Maryland. "This is no small task that is being requested," he said.

Aristide made his call publicly last week in an interview with *The Washington Post*. Even before his return to power in September, Aristide and his supporters pressed the Clinton administration for a pledge to carry out an aggressive disarmament campaign. They fear that remnants of the military regime and its supporters will try to recover power when the United Nations peacekeep-

ing force, which is to replace U.S. troops, leaves the country, probably in early 1996.

The U.S. troops, which went into Haiti in September after a deal was cut with the then-military leaders, paved the way for the Oct. 15 restoration of Aristide as president.

In the Friday interview, Aristide said the United States has "to continue disarming the terrorists, those who are killing people and still have weapons, waiting for the moment to come out and make trouble."

Aristide, in the first public note of discord between his government and Washington since his return, said: "It is not enough to just disarm some of them. We should be moving fast. This is the cry of the Haitian people. It is the will of the Haitian people, and I welcome this cry and I share it."

U.S. officials, who harbor memories of the messy effort to disarm militias in Somalia during a tumultuous peacekeeping mission there in

1992-93, are reluctant to get involved in a gun hunt that might mean casualties.

Perry placed the burden on the future Haitian police force, much of which is currently in training. He said that several thousand police would be readied in the coming year. "Now that's the key," he said during an appearance on NBC's "Meet the Press."

U.S. troops have rounded up 14,000 weapons during searches and gun purchase offers, Perry said. Noting that a recent spot check of cars on the road produced only one weapon, he concluded, "It's not clear that there are a lot of loose weapons around there."

The dispatch of troops to Haiti in September went against public and congressional opinion. Republicans in particular appear ready to pounce on any misstep, and violence and casualties could sink the entire occupation, which has become a source of pride for administration foreign policymakers.

Republicans take control of the House and Senate in January, and the administration is likely to be even more wary of deeper involvement.

Yesterday, on the same "Meet the Press" show, the future Senate majority leader, Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), repeated his demand for an immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops. Any disarming ought to be done by the Haitian police, Dole said.

Most U.S. troops, except for 3,000 that will join the U.N. peacekeeping force, should be out of Haiti early next year.

Dole said that "there may come a time" when Congress would cut off funds for the Haiti mission. Perry estimated the cost in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Dole said it has cost \$1.5 billion.

WASHINGTON POST

Nov. 28, 1994

Pg. 8

## Dole Backs Helms For Chairmanship; Perry Issues Rebuke

Reuter

Incoming Senate majority leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) said yesterday that Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) looks set to take over in January as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, despite remarks he made last week about President Clinton.

Two Democratic senators said last week that Helms "disqualifies himself" from heading the panel by having suggested in an interview that Clinton "better have a bodyguard" if he visits military bases in Helms's home state of North Carolina. Helms also had said Clinton was not up to being commander in chief of the armed forces, a

position the president holds under the Constitution.

Sens. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) and Thomas A. Daschle (D-S.D.) had urged Dole to oppose Helms's chairmanship of the powerful committee.

But Dole, on NBC's "Meet the Press," brushed aside calls to block Helms from getting the panel's top spot.

"We have a seniority system," Dole said. "We think it works." But he added: "When you have the chairmanship, there's probably certain things you shouldn't say even in jest."

On the same program, Defense Secretary William J. Perry said he was "appalled" that Helms had questioned whether Clinton was up to the role of commander in chief. "I think it is very inappropriate for any senior official in the U.S. government to question that constitutional command or to say anything that would erode that," Perry said.

Helms has said it was a mistake to say some of the things he did, but he has not apologized.



SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY  
COMMENTS IN PRESS STAKEOUT FOLLOWING APPEARANCE ON INTERVIEW ON "MEET  
THE PRESS"  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
NOVEMBER 27, 1994

Q: [inaudible]... do not see a real turning point, at this point, would you call that, not only in the war, itself, in Bosnia, but in terms of NATO's relations with the United States?

A: The situation in Bosnia, as we stand here, is that the Serbs are in control of the situation. They have not occupied the city, we don't know whether they plan to, but it seems that they could if they choose to.

The United Nations does not have sufficient force on the ground [inaudible]. Obviously, the government forces there are not capable of stopping [inaudible]. The factor which could make a difference is the use of NATO airpower. [inaudible] but, first, is that the United Nations has not requested the use of NATO airpower. We have no authority to go in with our airpower and [inaudible]. Secondly, even if we did go in, the airpower is not capable of determining the outcome on the ground,... to punish the Serbs and, perhaps, to deter the Serbs, but it is not capable... to truly, take control of the situation, and affect the outcome on the ground... would require the insertion of a very large number of ground troops [inaudible]

[inaudible]President Clinton [inaudible] before him President Bush made the same decision. Our best military estimate is that to go in and truly affect the outcome of the war -- "win the war," so to speak -- would involve several hundred thousand ground troops [inaudible] a long protracted [inaudible]. We are not inclined to do that, therefore, we will have to accept the outcome that [inaudible].

Now, we are prepared to use NATO airpower -- the robust use of NATO airpower -- provided the United Nations requests it.

Q: Will it be a failure of policy if we just [inaudible] the Serbs?

2465

A: The NATO policy has been to provide support to the U.N. We have provided that support when asked for... U.N. policy is a peacekeeping policy -- its not to win the war -- its to keep the war from increasing in its level of violence, until a peace can be reached. They're still trying to get a cease-fire. I would not rule out that as a possibility. If they can get the cease-fire, this will be a successful move on the part of the U.S.

Thank you.

- END -